

REMARKS

Claims 8-12, 15-17, 21-26, and 29-38 are now pending in the application. The examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a). This rejection is respectfully traversed. The examiner states that the “newly added/amended limitations in the claims” filed 1/31/03 must be shown or the features cancelled from the claims. Each and every added/amended limitation is shown in the drawings. Inasmuch as the office action fails to itemize the items alleged to be missing from the drawings, it is difficult for the applicant to properly address this objection. However, in an effort to accommodate the examiner’s request, the following is provided.

With reference to Fig. 1, claim 8 calls for an insulating film 16 overlapping a wiring layer 12 except for a connection portion 15b. A pixel electrode 17 is connected to the connection portion 15b. The insulating film 16 underlies a peripheral portion of the pixel electrode 17. The peripheral portion of the pixel electrode 17 is shown in Figure 1 between the outer perimeter edge of the pixel electrode 17 and the inner edge of the insulating film 16 which is bordered by a dashed line and cross hatched. This peripheral portion is discontinuous in that the pixel electrode 17 does not overlap the insulating film 16 at the area of the connection portion 15b. Claim 8 also calls for a underside of a central portion of the pixel electrode 17 not overlapping the insulating film 16. This is shown in Fig. 1 inboard of the dashed line depicting the border of the

insulating film 16 within the interior of the pixel electrode 17. The central portion of the pixel electrode 17 extends continuously from the connection portion 15b inasmuch as no insulating material 16 disrupts this path. Claims 16 and 29 should now also be readily understood in view of the explanation for claim 8 given above.

If after considering the above explanations, the examiner would like a further explanation of the claimed elements, he is invited to telephone the undersigned so that a personal interview may be conducted.

REQUEST

The examiner requests that the applicant point out the relevant portions of the specification which discloses/teaches all "added/amended limitations". A very good explanation of the claimed subject matter can be found on pages 8 and 9 of the application as filed. The examiner should also consider the support for these limitations as found in Fig. 1 as described above with respect to claim 8.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 39 stands objected to for an informality. Claim 39 is cancelled.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 8-10, 16, 21-23, 29, 31-32, 37-38 and 39-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Fujikawa et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,719,647). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding, claims 39-44 are cancelled.

The examiner relies on Fujikawa for disclosing most aspects of the claimed

invention. However, Fujikawa fails to disclose, teach or suggest the claimed arrangement of the pixel electrode relative to the insulating film. More particularly, with respect to claims 8, 16, and 29, the claimed pixel electrode overlaps the insulating film along a peripheral portion of the pixel electrode. A central portion of the pixel electrode does not overlap the insulating film. The insulating film overlaps a wiring layer except for a connection portion. In this way, the connection portion of the wiring layer may be connected to the pixel electrode.

In contrast, Fujikawa teaches a pixel electrode 9 on an insulating layer 16. While the pixel electrode projects downwardly into a contact hole, the pixel electrode 9 does not include a central portion not overlapping the insulating film 16. This can be most readily appreciated with reference to Figs. 4c and 4d of Fujikawa. In Fig. 4c, the insulating film 16 is disposed on a substrate 14 except for the contact hole 10. Thereafter, the pixel electrode 9 is disposed on the insulating film 16. The contact hole 10 extends through the pixel electrode 9 (although apparently with a smaller size). As compared to Figure 1 of the present application, it can be readily appreciated that the pixel electrode 9 fails to include a central region not overlapping the insulating film 16. Rather, the pixel electrode 9 overlaps the insulating film 16 nearly in its entirety. The only exception being the contact hole 10.

Thus, at a minimum, Fujikawa does not disclose the insulating film underlying a peripheral portion of the pixel electrode except for a portion of the pixel electrode connected to the connection portion and a central portion of the pixel electrode so that an underside of the central portion of the pixel electrode does not overlap the insulating film. furthermore, Fujikawa does not disclose the central portion of the pixel electrode extending continuously from the connection portion without underlying the insulating film.

The remaining claims should be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to the independent claims.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 11-12, 15, 17, 24-26, 30, and 33-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujikawa as applied above. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to their base claims. As such, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Aug 28, 2003

By: 
G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 25,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600